



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

member of the family of nations entitled to as much respect as those of the greatest empire, and we deem the observance of that respect to be the chief guarantee for the weak against the oppression of the strong. We neither claim nor desire any rights or privileges of power that we do not freely concede to every American republic."

This fundamental utterance he has repeated and unfolded in all his subsequent speeches. He has thus set forth, in the clearest and most satisfactory way, the policy towards all other nations which the spirit of our constitution and of our institutions demands of us, and this declaration of the true policy of the Great Republic toward the other American States has been hailed with unbounded delight in the South American capitals.

The service which Mr. Root has thus been rendering is of the very highest order, and deserves the cordial recognition of all the friends of international righteousness and peace. It is worthy of the very best traditions of the State Department. It has met with the most sincere approval of practically all the people of the nation, who desire to live in friendly and brotherly relations with all our national neighbors.

But the real and permanent effects of the Secretary's mission and of what he has said cannot be determined in a day or a year. It will depend upon the faithfulness with which his pledges are carried out by our government and people. He has put us all under very high obligation to conduct ourselves in such a way as to demonstrate to South America that he has truly interpreted our national spirit. He has been taken at his word by those to whom he has spoken so explicitly and so eloquently. It will be a sore disappointment to them if they shall find hereafter that he was speaking only by conjecture, and the last state of their distrust will be much worse than the first. But if the policy so finely expounded by him is faithfully adhered to by our government and people, the peace and harmony of the western world will be no empty sound, but will be a power for civilization and progress in the world heretofore only faintly realized.

The logical sequence of Mr. Root's trip will be the reduction of the Monroe Doctrine to its original significance, if not general silence about it hereafter, now that all the republics south of us have been invited to the Second Hague Conference, and have thus been recognized as permanent independent members in the family of nations. Logically also the "big stick" must now be laid on the shelf, or, better still, put into the fire and reduced to ashes.

The Pan-American Conference, through the influence of Mr. Root, Mr. Buchanan, etc., has so far been eminently successful, and its results, of which we shall speak in a future number, are sure to prove of great value both to America and to the world.

The Practical Problem of Limitation of Armaments.

The question of a limitation of armaments has now become so urgent that the manner in which the arrest and possible reduction are to be effected are beginning to be seriously studied. The Interparliamentary Union, at its recent Conference in London, at which twenty-two parliaments were represented, instructed its groups in the various countries to endeavor to secure a careful preliminary investigation of the subject by the national governments, as a preparation for a successful international examination of it at the coming Hague Conference. It is certain to be, therefore, the great international study of the coming winter.

Everybody must realize the difficulty and intricacy of the problem. We shall all agree with the remark of the *New York Tribune*, in a recent editorial, that "arranging for a limitation of armaments is not as simple a matter as the ordering of a dinner or the selection of a vacation tour."

But, nevertheless, the arrangement will be made sooner or later, simply because it must be made. There is no way around it. The English government and parliament have spoken. Italy and France have declared that they will follow. The Interparliamentary Union, the Mohonk Conference, the National Peace Congresses have uttered their voice—the voice of the world. Some have proposed the ignoring of the matter totally, on the theory that the completion of the arbitration system and the establishment of a world-congress will cause the armaments to fall away of themselves. But that, plausible as it may seem on the surface, is simply to dodge the question. A little thinking will convince any one that the huge present system of armaments, with its supporting rivalries, its ramifications in business, social and political spheres, is not going to tumble down some fine morning like a decayed wall. The fact is that the completion of the arbitration system and the creation of a permanent world-congress cannot well be effected without a simultaneous solution, or partial solution, of the armament problem. The questions are coördinate and must be handled together.

We publish on another page this month the translation of a very able article on "The Formula for Disarmament," by Otto Umfrid, of Stuttgart, one of the ablest and most practical of the German peace workers. We shall hope to publish other studies of the subject during the fall and winter. Mr. Umfrid takes the national income as the basis of a possible rearrangement and reduction of the armaments. It will be easy to raise objections to this plan, as to that based on population, or on amount of commerce, or extent of coastline, or present size of armies and navies, etc.

No one of the bases which have been suggested is likely to be accepted in its simplicity. Some combination of points from the most important of them may be finally adopted as a compromise. It is much easier to say what will not prove acceptable to the powers than what will receive their approval. Captain Mahan's suggestion of a limitation of the size and cost of battleships is sure to be rejected, as such a limitation, if effected, would leave the real problem untouched. General Miles' idea of one soldier to every one thousand of the population would find stout opponents, as it would leave some of the powers at such a disadvantage from the point of view of actual war. An agreement not to employ new types of arms and bullets will probably never be reached.

But, in spite of these difficulties, some workable scheme will be found by the united wisdom of the Hague Conference. The trend is now strongly in that direction, and "where there is a will there is a way." This way may possibly be found in a simple twofold agreement: first, not to increase either the armies or the navies beyond their present size; and, secondly, to fix a reduced maximum for both armies and navies,—say, at one-third or one-fifth of the size of the German army and the British navy,—to which all the armies and navies shall be reduced by the end of a period of five or ten years, the reserves of the land forces to be reduced in some similar proportion. A simple scheme of this kind, imperfect as it is, which would ultimately leave all the great powers on a practical equality, abolish the ruinous rivalry of the present time, and lift the burden of fear which oppresses the small powers, might easily furnish a real beginning of the solution of the greatest and most difficult practical problem which the nations have ever been compelled to face. If they can be induced to *begin* in a sincere and earnest way, they will soon find all reasons for vying with one another gone, and a new era, newer than any that has yet been seen, will have dawned on the world.

Editorial Notes.

Limitation of Armaments.

In our last issue we referred to the speech of Mr. d'Estournelles de Constant at the London Interparliamentary Conference on the subject of limitation of armaments, but had no account of the action taken on the subject. We have since received, in French, a copy of the resolution which the Executive Council, after much deliberation, presented to the Conference, which was unanimously adopted. It was as follows:

"Whereas, The growth of naval and military expenses which weigh upon the world is universally recognized as intolerable, the Interparliamentary Conference formally expresses the wish that the question of limitation of armaments may be inscribed upon the program of the next Hague Conference.

"The Conference decides that each group forming a part of the Interparliamentary Union shall without delay communicate this resolution to the government of their country, and shall use their strongest influence over the parliament to which they belong to the end that the question of limitation of armaments may be made the subject of a national study, necessary to the success of the subsequent international study."

This action of the Interparliamentary Union, following that of the British government and House of Commons, makes it certain that the subject of limitation and reduction of armaments will be considered at the coming Hague Conference. And it will come before the Conference in such a way as to insure important results. The difficulty with the question of disarmament at the first Hague Conference, as Hon. Andrew D. White has declared, was that there had been no preliminary study of the subject, either by the Russian government, which brought it forward, or by anybody else. If the national groups of the Interparliamentary Union follow up, as they will certainly do, in their various parliaments, the instructions contained in the foregoing resolution, they will secure, in at least a considerable number of the more important parliaments, such a preliminary investigation the coming winter of the whole problem of armaments as will enable the Hague Conference to deal intelligently and effectively with the subject. There can be no turning back now. The matter has gone too far and secured too much support of the first order to admit of its being again turned down in the World's Peace Conference at The Hague.

The following passage from Wm. J. Bryan's great speech at the Interparliamentary Conference in London in July, in support of his resolution for impartial arbitration in every dispute before resort to war,—*"a peace speech, terse, rapid, epigrammatical,"* says the *Herald of Peace*,—will almost certainly hereafter be often cited as one of the great bits of American oratory:

"The first advantage of the resolution is that it secures the investigation of the facts, and if you can but separate the fact from the question of honor, the chances are a hundred to one that you will settle both the fact and the question of honor. Passion is not often roused by questions which do not affect a nation's integrity and honor. If we can but stay the hand of war until conscience has asserted itself, war will be more remote. When men are mad they swagger and talk about what they can do. When men are calm they think about what they ought to do. The second advantage is that investigation gives time for calm consideration. Man excited is a very different animal from man calm. The third advantage is that it gives an opportunity of mobilizing public opinion for the compelling of a peaceable settlement. Public opinion is a controlling force; it is going to be more and more a power in the world. One